

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

No. C 00-00505 WHA

12 v.

13 CHARLES W. McCALL,

14 Defendant.
15 _____/

**ORDER RE REQUEST FOR
DISCOVERY**

16 Defendant alleges that “substantial plea discussions took place in June of 2009, resulting
17 in a government proposal, which, whether or not designated as an ‘offer,’ constituted a blue print
18 for settling the case on clear terms” (Reply Br. at 17). Thus, defendant is requesting discovery
19 from the government regarding whether it received any response from his trial attorneys as he
20 “has no way of getting at such documents without the discovery tools provided by the law.”

21 *Ibid.*

22 Defendant’s claims are all questionable. He mainly relies on an email written by one of
23 his trial attorneys, Michael Shepard, to his other trial attorneys. The email, however, does not
24 state whether the government or Shepard proposed the “blueprint” for a possible plea agreement
25 (Decl. of Michael J. Shepard, Exh. A). Moreover, no “clear terms” for a possible plea agreement
26 were discussed. In the email, Shepard guesses on the “wide range” of sentences that the
27 government could pursue under a possible plea agreement, but no specific sentence was actually
28 enumerated. Most importantly, defendant may determine whether the government received a

1 response from his trial attorneys regarding the purported plea agreement by asking his trial
2 lawyers directly.

3 Here, defendant's discovery request is a mere fishing expedition to "explore [his] case in
4 search of its existence." *Calderon v. United States District Court for the Northern District of*
5 *California*, 98 F.3d 1102, 1106 (9th Cir.1996) (citations omitted). Defendant will have until
6 **MAY 7, 2014**, to request from his trial attorneys any documentation that he believes will support
7 his Section 2255 motion. If his trial attorneys do not cooperate, the Court may consider
8 scheduling an evidentiary hearing directed at his trial attorneys as to why they will not produce
9 the requested documentation. A new motion for an evidentiary hearing must be filed then. This
10 motion for discovery is **DENIED**.

11
12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13
14 Dated: December 24, 2013.

15 
16 WILLIAM ALSUP
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28